REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7 and 31 have been amended. These claims have been amended to recite the features previously recited in now canceled claims 13, 14, 24, 25 and 35. New claims 39-43 have been added. These new claims are supported, for example, by specification pages 8-13 (please also see Fig. 5A, 5B, 6, and 7). Thus, claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-43 are now pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,832,481 (*Sheffield*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*). However, the Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) as being anticipated by Habraken, Joe, "Using Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition", 09/1998, Que Corporation, pages 337-340 and pages 411-425 (hereinafter "*Lotus*"). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

As noted in the specification, the invention relates to an assistant for creation of layouts/reports for databases. (Specification, page 5, lines 22-28). It is respectfully submitted that it will be apparent to those skilled in the art that the assistant can be implemented as a database program. As noted in the specification, often a database program provide a user interface that allows a user to view the data, which has been stored in a database, in various ways. (Specification, page 1, line 22-30). Furthermore, Figs. 8-22 of the application illustrate a series of screen depictions of an interview sequence in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. Clearly, this interview sequence can be performed by a database program or an assistant. This is evident because, among other things, one skilled in the art will appreciate that a database program or an assistant can be programmed to provide a graphical interface in a manner illustrated by Figs. 8-22. Still further, one skilled in the art will be able to implement a database program that provides the claimed features of claim 1. It should be noted that claim 1, among other things, recites that the organized information is

associated with a database and a database program performs the interview sequence and automatically generate the report or layout based on the organized information. For example, Figs. 4-7 illustrate various flow diagrams that can be used to implement a database program that can perform an interview sequence and automatically generate the report or layout in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Lotus* teaches creating a script to run the report in the context of the invention. (Office Action, page 6, discussion of claim 24). It is noted that *Lotus* describes that a "Lotus 1-2-3" enables one to record keystrokes and mouse manipulation. The script can be recorded by turning on the script recorder, performing one or more actions and then turning off the script recorder. Thus, a user can use this feature to create a script. (*Lotus*, pages 338-339) This feature, however, does not teach or suggest an interview sequence comprising of determining whether a script should be generated for the report or layout. Furthermore, *Lotus* does not teach or suggest automatically generating the script for the report or layout by when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated. It should be noted that the script when executed allows another report or layout to be automatically generated based on the interview sequence.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over *Lotus* for at least these reasons. Independent claims 17 and 31 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 17 and 31 claims and their dependent claims are also patentable over *Lotus* for similar reasons. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a).

It is further submitted that *Lotus* does not teach or suggest any of the additional features recited in the new claims 39-43. Thus, claims 39-43 are patentable over *Lotus* for yet additional reasons. Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the

above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. CLARP026).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300